by that name; partly perhaps as endeiwpuring thereby, to decline that odious and ignor name of Atheists, and partly as conceiving, that whatsoever is the first principle of things, ingenerable and incorruptible, and the cause of aM other things besides itself, -must therefore needs be the divinest thing of all.' Wherefore, by the wordGod, these mean nothing else, but that which is *aytwrirov,* unmade or self-existent, and the *d^9* or first principle of things. Thus it was before observed,* that Anaximander called infinite matter, devoid of all manner of life, TO 0«ov, or God ; and Pliny, the corporeal world, endued with nothing but a plastic unknowing nature, Numen; as also others in Aristotle,[b] upon the same account, called the inanimate elements gods, as supposed first principles of things ; *Oeoi* Sc *KOL ravTa** for tibese are also^gods.—And indeed Aristotle himself seems to be guilty of this miscarriage of abusing the word God after this manner, when, speaking of love and-chaos, as the two first principle^of things, he liust, according to the laws &f ntar, be understood to call thecnvbotfa^'

gods *I 'rovrovg* /i£v ovv TTWC }(fn}
Siave^m, Irep ! TOU T/C Trpcuroc, c^ecrrw
Kptveiv ticrrspov' Coil-- •••
cerning these two (gods) how they ought^ to be ranked, and which of them is to first, whether love or chatos^ resolved .—Which passstg^: of '* agree with that of Epicharmus,[0] 'AXX<t

. ^--'' ' •'•:'-i:-' i.':•-..-:..- ':»'"*di* i:J Jl ,.1T '

[b] This ifc,a mistake ot Dr. those philosopbefs,' who pedecles, tione et Cormptione? cap. vi. p. 734. tom. i. oper.

«•' Apud